



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,509	06/15/2006	Eddy Jean Edgard Freyne	PRD-2168USPCT	7434
27777	7590	11/26/2008	EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON			JARRELL, NOBLE E	
JOHNSON & JOHNSON				
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			1624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/26/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/596,509	FREYNE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	NOBLE JARRELL	1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 8-11 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 and 11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 8-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/06/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group IV in the reply filed on 9/17/2008 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 3 and 11 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 9/17/2008.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 8-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: non-elected material exists within these claims. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for *in vitro* inhibition of EGFR kinase or the SKOV-3 cell line, does not reasonably provide enablement for *in vivo* inhibition of EGFR kinase or the SKOV-3 cell line, and consequently, the treatment of any type of cell proliferative disorder. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988). The court in Wands states, "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation, such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue', not 'experimentation'" (*Wands*, 8

USPQ2sd 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations" (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the breadth of the claims; (3) the state of the prior art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the relative skill of those in the art; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

Consideration of the relevant factors sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case for lack of enablement is set forth herein below:

*(1) The nature of the invention and (2) the breadth of the claims:*

The claims are drawn to treatment of cell proliferative disorders though use of macrocyclic compound that is composed partly of a quinoline connected to a phenyl ring through an NH. Thus, the claims taken together with the specification imply these compounds can treat cell proliferative disorders.

*(3) The state of the prior art and (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art:*

Whitley et al. (*Proceeding of the American Association of Cancer Research, 2004, 45*, abstract 4918) teach that results of *in vivo* studies contradict *in vitro* studies of inhibition of an SKOV-3 cell line.

Rusnak et al. (*Cancer Research, 2001, 61*(19), 7196-7203) teach that it is unpredictable whether or not *in vitro* inhibition of EGFR kinase works *in vivo* (page 7201, column 2, paragraph 1).

*(5) The relative skill of those in the art:*

Those of relative skill in the art are those with level of skill of the authors of the references cited to support the examiner's position. The relative skill of those in this art is MD's, PhD's, or those with advanced degrees and the requisite experience in inhibition of the SKOV-3 cell line and EGFR kinase.

*(6) The amount of direction or guidance presented and (7) the presence or absence of working examples:*

The specification has provided guidance for *in vitro* inhibition of EGFR kinase or the SKOV-3 cell line.

However, the specification does not provide guidance for the *in vivo* EGFR kinase or the SKOV-3 cell line, and consequently, the treatment of any type of cell proliferative disorder.

*(8) The quantity of experimentation necessary:*

Considering the state of the art as discussed by the references above, particularly with regards to claim 10 and the high unpredictability in the art as evidenced therein, and the lack of guidance provided in the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue experimentation to practice the invention commensurate in the scope of the claims.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-2, 4, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As for any occurrence of an alkyl group, these terms are written as terminal groups in the current claim. Normally, when an alkyl group is internal, it is an alkylene group. In claim 10, what is considered a "therapeutically effective amount"? In claim 10, what specific disease or disorder is being treated? A "cell proliferative disorder" could be psoriasis ("Psoriasis", <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/cgi/mesh/2008/MB.cgi>, accessed November 21, 2008) or cancer. The identity of the disease is needed to determine what applicant intends as a

"therapeutically effective amount" since the etiology of the diseases characterized nebulously as proliferative diseases are quite diverse and disparate.

8. Regarding claim 9, the phrase "such as for example" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

***Conclusion***

9. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NOBLE JARRELL whose telephone number is (571)272-9077. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 A.M - 6:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Noble Jarrell/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1624

/James O. Wilson/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624